

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/730,202	ONO, HIROMIKI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Charles G Freay	3746	

All Participants:

(1) Charles G Freay.

(2) Mr. Bruce Adams.

Status of Application: pending

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 12 April 2005

Time: 12:00

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

rejection under 35 USC 102

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

Harlin et al (USPN 3684412)


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner communicated that the Harlin reference would be applied under 35 USC 102 to reject claim 1. The examiner stated that the limitation of a "peripheral installation portion" was being given a broad interpretation. the examiner noted that if claim 1 were amended to set forth that the peripheral installation portion included at least one protrubance then the claim would be favorably considered. Mr. Adams communicated the proposal to his clients. They rejected this proposed amendment because they thought that the Harlin et al reference did not disclose the peripheral installation portion and felt the examiner was interpreting this limitation to broadly. A request was made for the rejection in writing so the applicants could clearly understand the examiner's position with regards to Harlin et al.